Octet magnetic moments and the violation of CGSR in χQM with configuration mixing

Harleen Dahiya and Manmohan Gupta
Department of Physics, Centre of Advanced Study in Physics, Panjab University,Chandigarh-160 014, India.

Octet baryon magnetic moments are calculated within χQM, respecting color spin spin forces (Szczepaniak *et al.*, PRL **87**, 072001(2001)), incorporating the orbital angular momentum as well as the quark sea contribution through the Cheng and Li mechanism (PRL **80**, 2789(1998)). Using configuration mixing generated by color spin spin forces as well as the concept of "effective" quark mass to include the effects of confinement, we are able to get an excellent fit to the octet magnetic moments as well as the violation of Coleman Glashow Sum Rule (CGSR) without any further input except for the ones already used in χQM as well as in NRQM. Specifically, in the case of p, Σ^+, Ξ^o, and violation of CGSR we get a perfect fit whereas in almost all the other cases the results are within 5% of the data.

arXiv:hep-ph/0203017v1 2 Mar 2002

The EMC measurements [1] in the deep inelastic scattering had shown that only a small fraction of the proton's spin is carried by the valence quarks. This "unexpected" conclusion from the point of view of Non Relativistic Quark Model (NRQM), usually referred to as "proton spin crisis", becomes all the more intriguing when it is realized that NRQM is able to give a reasonably good description of magnetic moments using the assumption that magnetic moments of quarks are proportional to the spin carried by them. Further, this issue regarding spin and magnetic moments becomes all the more difficult to understand when it is realized that the magnetic moments of baryons receive contribution not only from the magnetic moments carried by the valence quarks but also from various complicated effects, such as, orbital excitations [2], sea quark polarization [3–5], effects of the chromodynamic spin-spin forces [6,7], effect of the confinement on quark masses [8,9], pion cloud contributions [10], loop corrections [11], relativistic and exchange current effects [12], etc. The problem regarding magnetic moments gets further complicated when one realizes that Coleman Glashow Sum Rule (CGSR) [13], valid in large variety of models [14,15], is convincingly violated by the data [16]. If ΔCG is the deviation from the CGSR, then experimentally $\Delta\mathrm{CG} = 0.49 \pm 0.05$, clearly depicting the violation of CGSR by ten standard deviations. As ΔCG=0, in most of the calculations, a reproduction of ΔCG would provide a viable clue for the dynamics of constituents of nucleon.

In this context, it is interesting to note that the Chiral Quark Model (χQM) [5,17] with SU(3) symmetry is not only able to give a fair explanation of "proton spin crisis" [1] but is also able to give a fair account of $\bar{u} - \bar{d}$ asymmetry [18–20] as well as the existence of significant strange quark content $\bar{s}$ in the nucleon [21]. Further, χQM with SU(3) symmetry is also able to provide fairly satisfactory explanation for baryon magnetic moments [3,5,17] as well as the absence of polarizations of the antiquark sea in the nucleon [22] . The predictions of the χQM, particularly in regard to hyperon decay parameters [23], can be improved if symmetry breaking effects [4] are taken into account. However, χQM with symmetry breaking, although gives a fairly good description of magnetic moments, is not able to describe ΔCG. In this regard, it is to be noted that some recent attempts to describe ΔCG within χQM, resort to additional inputs [15,24] over and above the basic premises of χQM.

In a recent interesting work, Cheng and Li [25] have shown that, within χQM with SU(3) symmetry breaking, a long standing puzzle, "Why the NRQM is able to give a fair description of baryon magnetic moments" can be resolved if one considers the pions acting as Goldstone Bosons also have angular momentum and therefore, contribute to the baryon magnetic moments as well. However, this contribution gets effectively cancelled by the sea quark polarization effect leaving the description of magnetic moments in terms of the valence quarks in accordance with NRQM hypothesis. One can easily examine that the Cheng and Li proposal does not lead to exact cancellation of the sea and orbital part for all the baryons, therefore it needs to be examined in detail for the octet baryon magnetic moments.

Similarly, in a very recent development, Szczepaniak and Swanson [26] have shown that the constituent quarks undergoing hyperfine chromodynamic spin spin interactions respect chiral symmetry. In view of the fact that χQM incorporates constituent quarks as essential ingredients and NRQM with chromodynamic spin spin forces is known to describe vast amount of spectroscopic data [26–29], it therefore becomes interesting to investigate the problem of magnetic moments in χQM with spin spin forces. Infact, it has already been shown recently [30] that the χQM with spin spin forces ($\chi\mathrm{QM}_{gcm}$) as well as SU(3) and axial U(1) symmetry breakings improves the predictions of χQM with SU(3) symmetry breaking, however the issue of magnetic moment has not been studied in detail.

One of the difficulty which NRQM has to face is how to include the effects of quark confinement. Pending solutions of QCD in the confinement regime, it has been shown that the effects of confinement can be incorporated in NRQM by considering "effective" quark masses [8,9]. In the context of magnetic moments this essentially replaces constituent quark masses by "effective" quark masses, specific to a given baryon, and it has been shown to improve the performance of NRQM as far as magnetic moments are concerned [8].

The purpose of the present communication is to investigate, within χQM, the effects of orbital currents, as advocated by Cheng and Li [25], sea polarization, chromodynamic spin spin forces, "effective" masses on octet magnetic moments and CGSR. While pursuing this goal, we have kept in mind that the parameters responsible for successes of the χQM as well as the NRQM with chromodynamic spin spin forces are not to be disturbed.

To begin with we consider the essentials of χQM with chromodynamic spin spin forces (χQM$_{gcm}$) discussed in detail in Ref [30]. In χQM, the basic process is the emission of a Goldstone Boson (GB) which further splits into $q\bar{q}$ pair, for example,

$$q_{\pm} \rightarrow GB^0 + q^{'}_{\mp} \rightarrow (q\bar{q}^{'}) + q^{'}_{\mp}. \tag{1}$$

The effective Lagrangian describing interaction between quarks and the octet GB and singlet $\eta^{'}$ is $\mathcal{L} = g_8 \bar{q}\phi q$, where g_8 is the coupling constant and

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^o}{\sqrt{2}} + \beta\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} + \zeta\frac{\eta^{'}}{\sqrt{3}} & \pi^+ & \alpha K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^o}{\sqrt{2}} + \beta\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} + \zeta\frac{\eta^{'}}{\sqrt{3}} & \alpha K^o \\ \alpha K^- & \alpha\bar{K}^o & -\beta\frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{6}} + \zeta\frac{\eta^{'}}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

SU(3) symmetry breaking is introduced by considering different quark masses $m_s > m_{u,d}$ as well as by considering the masses of GBs to be non-degenerate ($M_{K,\eta} > M_{\pi}$) [4,15], whereas the axial U(1) breaking is introduced by $M_{\eta^{'}} > M_{K,\eta}$ [4,5,15]. The parameter $a(=|g_8|^2)$ denotes the transition probability of chiral fluctuation of the splittings $u(d) \rightarrow d(u) + \pi^{+(-)}$, whereas $\alpha^2 a$, $\beta^2 a$ and $\zeta^2 a$ denote the probability of transition of $u(d) \rightarrow s + K^{-(0)}$, $u(d,s) \rightarrow u(d,s) + \eta$ and $u(d,s) \rightarrow u(d,s) + \eta^{'}$ respectively.

The valence quarks of the χQM undergo chromodynamic spin spin forces as a consequence of which the constituent quark wave functions get "perturbed". For the present purpose it has been shown [7,27] that it is adequate to consider

$$\left| 8, \frac{1}{2}^+ \right\rangle = \cos\phi |56, 0^+ >_{N=0} + \sin\phi |70, 0^+ >_{N=2}, \tag{2}$$

for details of the perturbed wave functions, we refer the readers to [7,27].

Using the above wave function along with the orbital and sea contributions, as discussed by Cheng and Li, and the "effective" quark masses, we have carried out the calculations of octet baryon magnetic moments. Including the corrections induced by the spin spin forces and "effective" quark masses, the magnetic moment corresponding to a given baryon(B) can be written as

$$\mu_{total} = \mu_{val} + \mu_{sea} + \mu_{orbit}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mu_{val} = \sum_{q=u,d,s} \Delta q_{val} \mu_q$, $\mu_{sea} = \sum_{q=u,d,s} \Delta q_{sea} \mu_q$, μ_q $(q = u, d, s)$ is the quark magnetic moment and Δq $(q = u, d, s)$ represents the net spin polarization and is defined as $\Delta q = q_+ - q_- + \bar{q}_+ - \bar{q}_-$.

The valence contribution, Δq_{val}, can easily be calculated [4,5,15,30], for example, using Eq (2), for proton we have, $\Delta u_{val} = \cos^2\phi \left[\frac{4}{3}\right] + \sin^2\phi \left[\frac{2}{3}\right]$, $\Delta d_{val} = \cos^2\phi \left[-\frac{1}{3}\right] + \sin^2\phi \left[\frac{1}{3}\right]$, $\Delta s_{val} = 0$. Similarly one can calculate for other baryons. The sea contribution in the χQM basically comes from the splitting of GB into $q\bar{q}$ pair (Eq (1)). The contribution to baryon magnetic moments from the sea can easily be calculated within χQM$_{gcm}$ [5,15,30]. For the case of proton it is given as

$$\Delta u_{sea} = -\cos^2\phi \left[\frac{a}{3}(7 + 4\alpha^2 + \frac{4}{3}\beta^2 + \frac{8}{3}\zeta^2)\right] - \sin^2\phi \left[\frac{a}{3}(5 + 2\alpha^2 + \frac{2}{3}\beta^2 + \frac{4}{3}\zeta^2)\right], \tag{4}$$

$$\Delta d_{sea} = -\cos^2\phi \left[\frac{a}{3}(2 - \alpha^2 - \frac{1}{3}\beta^2 - \frac{2}{3}\zeta^2)\right] - \sin^2\phi \left[\frac{a}{3}(4 + \alpha^2 + \frac{1}{3}\beta^2 + \frac{2}{3}\zeta^2)\right] \tag{5}$$

$$\Delta s_{sea} = -a\alpha^2. \tag{6}$$

Similarly one can calculate Δq_{sea} and consequent contribution to magnetic moments for other baryons.

Following Cheng and Li [25], the μ_{orbit} for χQM$_{gcm}$ can easily be evaluated and for proton it is given as

$$\mu_{orbit} = \left[\frac{4}{3}\cos^2\phi + \frac{2}{3}\sin^2\phi\right] [\mu(u_+ \rightarrow)] + \left[-\frac{1}{3}\cos^2\phi + \frac{1}{3}\sin^2\phi\right] [\mu(d_+ \rightarrow)], \tag{7}$$

where $\mu(u_+ \rightarrow)$ and $\mu(d_+ \rightarrow)$ are the orbital moments of u and d quarks and are given as

$$\mu(u_+ \rightarrow) = \frac{a}{2M_{GB}(M_u + M_{GB})}\left[3(\alpha^2+1)M_u^2 + (\frac{1}{3}\beta^2 + \frac{2}{3}\zeta^2 - \alpha^2){M_{GB}}^2\right]\mu_N, \tag{8}$$

$$\mu(d_+ \rightarrow) = \frac{a}{4M_{GB}(M_u + M_{GB})}\frac{M_u}{M_d}\left[(3 - 2\alpha^2 - \frac{1}{3}\beta^2 - \frac{2}{3}\zeta^2){M_{GB}}^2 - 6M_d^2\right]\mu_N, \tag{9}$$

$$\tag{10}$$

(M, M_{GB}) are the masses of quark and GB, μ_N is the Bohr magneton. In a similar manner one can calculate the contributions for other baryons.

Before discussing the results, first we discuss the inputs required for numerical calculations. As is evident from the Eqs (3), the different inputs required pertain to χQM, configuration mixing generated by the chromodynamic spin spin forces and the NRQM. To this end, we have used the χQM parameters $a = 0.1$, $\alpha = 0.4$ and $\beta = 0.7$, as used in the case of χQM_{gcm} [30]. However, to fit the violation of the Gottfried Sum Rule [20] we have used $\zeta = -0.3 - \beta/2$ and $\zeta = -0.7 - \beta/2$ respectively for the E866 and the NMC data.

The orbital angular moment contributions are characterized by the parameters of χQM as well as the masses of the GBs. In view of the fact that the orbital contributions are dominated by the pion contributions, the contributions of other GBs being much smaller as compared to pionic contributions have been ignored in the numerical calculations. For evaluating the contribution of pions we have used its on mass shell value in accordance with several other similar calculations [31].

In the absence of any definite guidelines for the constituent quark masses, we have used their most widely accepted values in hadron spectroscopy [27–29,32], for example, $M_u = M_d = 330$ MeV. The strange quark mass corresponding to a given baryon is fixed from the sum rules implied by the chromodynamic spin spin forces, for example, $\Lambda - N = M_s - M_u$, $(\Sigma^* - \Sigma)/(\Delta - N) = M_u/M_s$ and $(\Xi^* - \Xi)/(\Delta - N) = M_u/M_s$ respectively fix M_s for Λ, Σ and Ξ baryons. The above mentioned quark masses and corresponding magnetic moments have to be further corrected by the confinement effects [8] which are effectively simulated in the present context by considering the quark magnetic moments as $\mu_d = -\left(1 - \frac{\Delta M}{M_B}\right)\mu_N$, $\mu_s = -\frac{M_u}{M_s}\left(1 - \frac{\Delta M}{M_B}\right)\mu_N$, $\mu_u = -2\mu_d$, where M_B is the mass of the baryon obtained additively from the quark masses and ΔM is the mass difference between the experimental value and M_B.

In Table 1, we have presented the results of our calculations for the octet baryons respectively for E866 and NMC data. From the table, it is evident that with the case of E866 data we are able to get an excellent fit for almost all the baryons. In fact, the fit is almost perfect for p, Σ^+ and Ξ^o, in the case of n, Σ^- and Λ the value is reproduced within 5% of experimental data. Only in the case of Ξ^- the deviation is somewhat more than 5%. Besides this we have also been able to get an excellent fit to the ΔCG. The fit becomes all the more impressive when it is realized that none of the magnetic moments are used as inputs. The results are equally impressive in the case of NMC data, however the lower values of individual magnetic moments compared to E866 data can be attributed to lower value of $|\zeta_{E866}|$ as compared to $|\zeta_{NMC}|$.

In the table, we have also mentioned our results without the configuration mixing, primarily to understand the role of configuration mixing. From the table we find that without configuration mixing the results are generally on the higher side which get corrected in the right direction by the inclusion of configuration mixing, for example, the valence contribution of the proton reduces form 3.17 to 2.94 and that of Σ^+ from 2.80 to 2.59. It is noted that configuration mixing reduces valence, sea and orbital contributions to the magnetic moments, however in the case of Ξ^- the configuration mixing improves the fit by contributing with the right sign. Thus, it seems that for the quark masses, which are able to reproduce hadronic spectroscopy, configuration mixing is important to fit individual magnetic moments.

A closer scrutiny of our results reveals several interesting points. The most interesting point is that the orbital angular momentum contribution and the contribution by sea quarks are fairly substantial, however they appear with the opposite sign in accordance with the conclusion of Cheng and Li [25]. In fact these contributions are delicately balanced so as to improve the overall fit of the magnetic moments without disturbing the successes of χQM. In fact from the table one can easily find out that except for Ξ^-, in all other cases the valence+sea contribution contributes to the overall magnetic moments with the right sign. This strongly supports the Cheng and Li dynamics for the constituents of the nucleon. One may wonder how to fit the magnetic moment of Ξ^- in the present scheme. As mentioned earlier, there are several other effects such as pion cloud contributions [10], loop corrections [11], relativistic and exchange current effects [12] etc. which also affect the magnetic moments. We believe the inclusion of these effects would perhaps improve the present fit further. In fact a cursory look at [10] suggests that pion loop corrections would compensate Ξ^- much more compared to other baryons hence providing an almost perfect fit.

It should also be mentioned that the mixing generated by spin spin forces and mass correction induced by confinement effects also play an important role in achieving an overall fit. In fact, it is the mass correction which affects the valence contribution to the magnetic moments with the right magnitudes in getting the right value of ΔCG.

To summarize, baryon magnetic moments have been calculated in the χQM, with one gluon exchange generated configuration mixing, by including the contribution of the $q\bar{q}$ sea polarization, orbital contribution of the sea as well as the correction induced on quark magnetic moments due to confinement effects. The calculations have been carried out by employing the same parameters which are responsible for the successes of χQM, in explaining the quark and spin distribution functions, as well as those of NRQM responsible for explaining vast amount of spectroscopic data. Apart from getting an excellent fit to the baryon magnetic moments, we are also able to get an almost perfect fit for ΔCG. In fact, the fit is almost perfect for p, Σ^+ and Ξ^o, in the case of n, Σ^- and Λ the value is reproduced within 5% of experimental data. Only in the case of Ξ^- the deviation is somewhat more than 5%. On closer examination of the results we find configuration mixing, effect of confinement on quarks as well as the orbital and sea polarizations, all play a crucial role in effecting the fit. In fact the mismatch in the orbital and sea polarizations correct the magnetic moments of valence quarks in the right direction in almost all the cases. This strongly supports the Cheng and Li dynamics for the χQM.

The authors would like to thank S.D. Sharma for fruitful discussions. H.D. would like to thank CSIR, Govt. of India, for financial support and the chairman, Department of Physics, for providing facilities to work in the department.

---

[1] J. Ashman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 206**, 364(1998); Nucl. Phys. **B 328**, 1(1990).

[2] J. Franklin, Phys. Rev. **D 61**, 098301(2000) and references therein; D.B. Lichtenberg, Z. Phys. **C 7**, 143(1981); **C 17**, 57(1983).

[3] E.J. Eichten, I. Hinchliffe and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. **D 45**, 2269(1992).

[4] X. Song, J.S. McCarthy and H.J. Weber, Phys. Rev. **D 55**, 2624(1997); X. Song, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 4114(1998).

[5] T.P. Cheng and Ling Fong Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2872(1995); Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 344(1998); hep-ph/9709293.

[6] N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. **D 21**, 3175(1980).

[7] M. Gupta and N. Kaur, Phys. Rev. **D 28**, 534(1983).

[8] Ikuo S. Sogami and Noboru Oh'yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2295(1985); Kuang-Ta Chao, Phys. Rev. **D 41**, 920(1990).

[9] M. Gupta, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Phys. **16**, L213(1990).

[10] S. Theberge and A.W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. **D 25**, 284(1982); J. Cohen and H.J. Weber, Phys. Lett. **165B**, 229(1985).

[11] Loyal Durand and Phuoc Ha, Phys. Rev. **D 58**, 013010(1998).

[12] K. Dannbom, L. Ya. Glozman, C. Helminen, D.O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. **A 616**, 555(1997).

[13] S. Coleman and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **6**, 423(1961).

[14] J. Franklin, Phys. Rev. **D 29**, 2648(1984); G.Karl, Phys. Rev. **D 45**, 247(1992); M.A. Luty, J. March-Russell and M. White, Phys. Rev. **D 51**, 2332(1995).

[15] J. Linde, T. Ohlsson and Hakan Snellman, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 452(1998).

[16] D.E. Groom et. al., Particle Data group, Euro. Phys. J. **C 15**, 1(2000).

[17] A. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B 234**, 189(1984).

[18] New Muon Collaboration, P. Amaudruz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2712(1991); M. Arneodo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 50**, R1(1994).

[19] E866/NuSea Collaboration, R.S. Towell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 052002(2001).

[20] K. Gottfried, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 1174(1967).

[21] T.P. Cheng, Phys. Rev. **D 13**, 2161(1976); NA51 Collaboration, A. Baldit *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 332**, 244(1994).

[22] SMC Collaboration, B. Adeva, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 369**, 93(1996).

[23] J. Ellis and R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. **D 9**, 1444(1974); R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Today. **48**(9), 24(1995).

[24] M. Casu and L.M. Sehgal, Phys. Rev. **D 55**, 2644(1997); B. Buck and S.M. Perez, Phys. Rev. **D 51**, 1419(1995).

[25] T.P. Cheng and Ling Fong Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2789(1998).

[26] Adam P. Szczepaniak and Erie S. Swanson Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 072001(2001).

[27] A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pene and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Rev. **D 12**, 2137(1975); **D 15**, 844(1977); R. Koniuk and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. **D 21**, 1868(1980); N. Isgur *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 35**, 1665(1987); P. Geiger and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. **D 55**, 299(1997) and references therein.

[28] A. De Rujula, H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. **D 12**, 147(1975).

[29] M. Gupta, S.K. Sood and A.N. Mitra, Phys. Rev. **D 16**, 216(1977); *ibid.* **D 19**, 104(1979); M. Gupta and S. Kanwar, Phys. Rev. **D 26**, 1194(1982); P. Nath, M. Gupta and A.K. Prasher, Phys. Rev. **D 26**, 565(1982).

[30] H. Dahiya and M. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 014013(2000).

[31] V. Elias, Mong Tong and M.D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. **D 40**, 3670(1989); Duane A. Dicus, Djordge Minic, Ubirajara van Klock and Roberto Vega, Phys. Lett. **B 284**, 384(1992); Y.B. Dong, K. Shimizu, Amand Faessler and A.J. Buchmann, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys, **25**, 1115(1999).

[32] F.E. Close, *An Introduction to Quarks and Partons*, Academic Press, New York, 1979; A. Le Yaouanc *et al.*, *Hadron Transitions in the Quark Model*, 1988.

Octet baryons	Data [16]	χQM without configuration mixing							χQM with configuration mixing						
		Valence	Sea		Orbital		Total		Valence	Sea		Orbital		Total	
			E866	NMC	E866	NMC	E866	NMC		E866	NMC	E866	NMC	E866	NMC
p	2.79	3.17	-0.59	-0.73	0.45	0.44	3.03	2.88	2.94	-0.55	-0.69	0.41	0.40	2.80	2.65
n	-1.91	-2.11	0.24	0.32	-0.37	0.38	-2.24	-2.17	-1.86	0.20	0.27	-0.33	-0.34	-1.99	-1.93
Σ^-	-1.16	-1.08	0.08	0.12	-0.26	-0.27	-1.26	-1.23	-1.05	0.07	0.14	-0.22	-0.26	-1.20	-1.17
Σ^+	2.45	2.80	-0.55	-0.68	0.37	0.39	2.62	2.51	2.59	-0.50	-0.64	0.34	0.36	2.43	2.31
Ξ^o	-1.25	-1.53	0.22	0.30	-0.16	-0.17	-1.47	-1.40	-1.32	0.21	0.26	-0.13	-0.14	-1.24	-1.20
Ξ^-	-0.65	-0.59	0.06	0.09	-0.01	-0.01	-0.54	-0.51	-0.61	0.06	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	-0.56	-0.54
Λ	-0.61	-0.69	0.05	0.10	-0.04	-0.05	-0.68	-0.64	-0.59	0.04	0.07	-0.04	-0.05	-0.59	-0.57
ΔCG	0.49 $\pm$ 0.05						0.46	0.42						0.48	0.44

TABLE I. Octet baryon magnetic moments (in units of μ_N).